

Synthetic Tabular Data Generation for Imbalanced Classification: The Surprising Effectiveness of an Overlap Class

Annie D’souza*, Swetha M*, Sunita Sarawagi

Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay

Abstract

Handling imbalance in class distribution when building a classifier over tabular data has been a problem of long-standing interest. One popular approach is augmenting the training dataset with synthetically generated data. While classical augmentation techniques were limited to linear interpolation of existing minority class examples, recently higher capacity deep generative models are providing greater promise. However, handling of imbalance in class distribution when building a deep generative model is also a challenging problem, that has not been studied as extensively as imbalanced classifier model training. We show that state-of-the-art deep generative models yield significantly lower-quality minority examples than majority examples. We propose a novel technique of converting the binary class labels to ternary class labels by introducing a class for the region where minority and majority distributions overlap. We show that just this pre-processing of the training set, significantly improves the quality of data generated spanning several state-of-the-art diffusion and GAN-based models. While training the classifier using synthetic data, we remove the overlap class from the training data and justify the reasons behind the enhanced accuracy. We perform extensive experiments on four real-life datasets, five different classifiers, and five generative models demonstrating that our method enhances not only the synthesizer performance of state-of-the-art models but also the classifier performance.

Code — <https://github.com/Annie2603/ORD>

1 Introduction

The problem of imbalance in class distributions is encountered in several fields, including fraud detection in the banking sector, disease diagnosis in the medical sector, and anomaly detection in finance, cybersecurity, and manufacturing industries. Imbalanced data refers to the distribution of classes or categories being highly skewed or disproportionate in a dataset, i.e., one class or category is significantly more prevalent than the others. The presence of imbalance introduces several challenges in training classification models as they are unable to learn the distribution of the rare

class. This has been a problem of long-standing interest and many different techniques have been proposed ranging from cost-sensitive loss functions (Zhou and Liu 2005), oversampling minority instances and/or under-sampling majority instances (Li et al. 2021), and augmentation with synthetic instances (Johnson and Khoshgoftaar 2019). In this paper, we focus on data augmentation-based techniques since these are particularly effective (Chawla et al. 2002). One popular classical data augmentation method, SMOTE, generates new minority instances using a convex combination of existing minority instances. However, recent deep data generators yield even higher accuracy due to the enhanced quality of generated examples.

Our focus in this paper is tabular data, and recently many high-quality generators have been proposed for generating tabular data ranging from GAN-based models like CTabGAN (Zhao et al. 2021) to diffusion-based models like TabSyn (Zhang et al. 2024) and ForestFlow (Jolicœur-Martineau, Fatras, and Kachman 2024) Most of these have been evaluated after training on balanced datasets, where their generated data have been shown to be highly effective in training classifiers that match the accuracy of real data. We are not aware of any study that evaluates them in highly imbalanced input data.

In this paper, we show that default training of generative models yields significantly worse quality minority instances than majority instances as measured by the label provided by an Oracle Bayesian model. Simple fixes to the problem by over and under-sampling initial real data distributions are not effective.

We present a method called ORD¹ that employs three key ideas to improve the training of imbalanced classifiers on tabular data using synthetic data generators: (1) We pre-process the available real data by identifying a small subset of the majority instances called the *overlap* set that lies on the boundary of majority and minority examples. (2) We modify the generator to be class conditional and generate three-way labeled instances corresponding to minority, overlapping majority, and clear majority. (3) We train the final classifier with a careful mix of real and synthetically generated instances comprising of balanced sample of synthetic data generated consisting of only the minority and clear ma-

*These authors contributed equally.

Copyright © 2025, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (www.aaai.org). All rights reserved.

⁰20d070028@iitb.ac.in, 23m0756@iitb.ac.in, sunita@iitb.ac.in

¹for Overlapped Region Detection

jority classes, and real minority.

Our method is orthogonal to the type of data generator and classifier, and we evaluate it on four different tabular data generator architectures and five different classification models. We perform a set of insightful ablation studies to tease apart the reason why our method outperforms existing methods. We conclude that our method yields improved accuracy both due to the generator providing higher quality synthetic minority examples, and the classifier improving due to selective under-sampling of overlapping majority examples.

The main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We evaluate state-of-the-art deep generative models for tabular data on imbalanced training data, and show that the quality of minority examples they generate is much worse than majority examples.
- We propose a new method called **ORD** that introduces a new class comprising of the subset of majority examples that lie in the boundary of the two classes, harnesses these to impose a ternary classification loss when training the generative model, and finally trains the classifier using generated examples that lie outside the overlap region.
- We propose a new SOTA model **CTabSyn**, a variation of TabSyn (Zhang et al. 2024) with the inclusion of ORD and conditional training and generation.
- We provide extensive experimental evaluation and proof that ORD provides significant increase in accuracy.
- We justify the enhanced accuracy by showing that our method both improves the quality of minority examples generated from our method, and the classifier gains from selective under-sampling of points in the overlap region.

2 Related Works

Traditionally, for training classifiers on imbalanced data, either the minority class is oversampled (Chawla et al. 2002) or majority class is undersampled. While efficient to some extent, majority under-sampling methods can discard potentially useful instances. Under sampling methods include cluster-based (Zhang, Zhang, and Wang 2010) under-sampling and Neighbourhood (Vuttipittayamongkol and Elyan 2020) based boundary undersampling. While over sampling methods include Tomek link based oversampling (Leng et al. 2024). Over-sampling can be ineffective when number of minority points is very small. In such cases, a more effective alternative is generating synthetic examples. A pioneering method in this category is SMOTE (for Synthetic Minority Oversampling Technique) (Chawla et al. 2002) that interpolates between minority points to generate new minorities. Several variations of SMOTE like BorderlineSMOTE (Han, Wang, and Mao 2005) and ADASYN (He et al. 2008), SMOTE Tomek (Wang et al. 2019) also exist.

Recently, deep generative models have provided much higher quality synthetic data across a variety of domains but we specifically focus on synthetic generators for tabular data. Conditional Tabular GAN (CTGAN) (Xu et al. 2019) is a Generative Adversarial Network based synthetic data generator. (Zhao et al. 2024) proposed to use density-based clustering to filter out noisy and boundary samples before feeding to CTGAN synthesizer. (Adiputra and

Wanchai 2023) proposes to oversample minority with CTGAN and combine with existing majority points. CTABGAN (Zhao et al. 2021) and CTABGAN+ (Zhao et al. 2022) are improvements over CTGAN. They perform training by sampling based on frequency of discrete columns to handle imbalances. Among the transformer-based (Vaswani 2017) synthesizers, Generation of Realistic Tabular data i.e. GReaT (Borisov et al. 2023), TabuLA model (Zhao, Birke, and Chen 2023) and Tabular Masked transformers (Gulati and Roysdon 2023), TabLLM (Hegselmann et al. 2023) are noteworthy synthetic data generators. Normalizing flows are also used to estimate the data distribution (Papamakarios, Pavlakou, and Murray 2017).

Of late, diffusion-based models are providing higher quality generations of synthetic data. These include the Denoising diffusion probabilistic model TabDDPM (Kotelnikov et al. 2022), TabSyn (Zhang et al. 2024) a Latent diffusion model, and Forestflow (Jolicoeur-Martineau, Fatras, and Kachman 2024) based on XGBoost (Chen and Guestrin 2016). We experiment with several categories of existing generators for tabular data, and found ForestFlow and TabSyn to provide the best accuracy.

Most existing data synthesizers have not considered **imbalanced** data. Ours is the first work that harnesses these models for generating synthetic data in the imbalanced class setting. We show that even the training of the generators is affected by the data imbalance. Our method ORD can be applied to all of the existing synthetic generators to enhance its quality of imbalanced data.

3 Problem Statement

Let $X = X_1 \times \dots \times X_d$ denote the space of d -dimensional record data where each X_j could be continuous or categorical. Let $Y = \{0, 1\}$ denote a binary class label space and $P(X, Y)$ denote their unknown joint distribution. We are provided a labeled dataset $D = \{(x_1, y_1) \dots (x_N, y_N)\}$ from the distribution where the fraction of instances in D with label 1 (minority class) is significantly smaller than (order of 2%) N . Our goal is to train a classifier $M : X \mapsto Y$ that provides high accuracy separately for both the minority and majority class. Instead of depending on the given imbalanced data D alone, we seek to sample synthetic data D_S from a generative model G trained on D . The classifier may be trained on a mix of synthetic and real data, but it is always evaluated on real data. A baseline method is using any of the SOTA tabular data generators to sample a balanced and large number of majority and minority examples as D_S to train the classifier M . In the following section, we present our proposed method that improves upon this baseline.

4 The Overlap Region Detection (ORD) method

One of the major sources of difficulty in training a classifier with highly imbalanced class distributions is that the discriminator fails to find any region where the minority examples are more prevalent than the majority examples. Our proposed ORD method addresses this challenge by increasing the concentration of minority examples in select regions via




Figure 1: The method of ORD and its application to generate synthetic data. Synthetic data is then used to train a better classifier compared to when no ORD is used. Steps in the overall algorithm: 1. To use k-fold training to identify the overlap in the validation set. This uncertainty is labelled as a third class label D_{01} . 2. Generate synthetic data using the three class dataset instead of binary class. The synthetic data quality is much better as the distribution is better reproduced by Generative models. 3. Train the final classifier with equal proportions of majority and minority synthetic data which discarding the overlapped region D_{01} which makes learning the decision boundary easier.

data generated from a deep generative model. We achieve this over three steps as outlined in Figure 1: (1) First, we identify a subset D_{01} of the majority instances D_0 in D that overlaps significantly with the minority examples. We use a time-tested k-fold cross-validation on a random forest classifier for this step, as we elaborate in Section 4.1. The output of this stage is a split of the majority instances D_0 into the overlapping majority D_{01} and clear majority $D_{00} = D_0 - D_{01}$. (2) Second, we train a conditional generator G on the ternary labeled data as elaborated in Section 4.2. We show that the introduction of a finer-grained class label dataset improves the quality of the generated examples in Table 4 (3) We train the final classifier M on synthetically generated instances S_1, S_{00} from G that are sampled in equal parts from the minority class and clear majority class, respectively. We show that excluding the overlap majority instances declutters the decision boundary and improves overall accuracy. We also found it useful to include only the minority instances D_1 in the training pool of M . The inclusion of real majority instances did not help improve the accuracy, possibly because the generator is well-trained on the majority instances. This is somewhat contrary to the results on balanced dataset where classifiers trained on real data outperform those on synthetic (Kotelnikov et al. 2022). Link to our git

4.1 Identifying Overlapping Majority Instances

In this section, we describe the method to identify the subset D_{01} of majority instances D_0 that we call the overlapping instances. Since neighborhood-based methods are not meaningful for high dimensional data, we use the disagreement of ensemble classifiers like random forest (Breiman 2001) to identify overlap. We depend on k-fold cross-validation to define splits used to train the random forest and obtain disagreement scores. Since we need the scores only on majority instances, we split only the majority instances D_0 into k disjoint sets F_1, \dots, F_k . For each fold j , we train a random forest RF_j on $D_0 - F_j$ instances as class 0 and D_1 as class 1. We then apply RF_j on the set-aside fold F_j and ob-

Algorithm 1: Synthesis and Classification using ORD

Input: Imbalanced real data: majority D_0 , minority D_1 .

Parameter: Threshold τ , Folds k

Output: Classifier M .

- 1: Split D_0 into k folds F_1, \dots, F_k .
 - 2: $D_{01}, D_{00} = \phi$
 - 3: **for** $i = 1$ to k **do**
 - 4: Train RF_j on $D_0 \setminus F_j$ and D_1
 - 5: **for** $x \in F_i$ **do**
 - 6: confidence_maj = RF_j .predict_prob_0(x)
 - 7: **if** confidence_maj $\leq 1 - \tau$ **then**
 - 8: Add x to D_{01} with class 2
 - 9: **else**
 - 10: Add x to D_{00} with class 0
 - 11: **end if**
 - 12: **end for**
 - 13: **end for**
 - 14: Train G on ternary labeled data $D_{00} \cup D_{01} \cup D_1$
 - 15: Sample S_{00}, S_1 from G for label 0 and 1.
 - 16: Train M using $S_{00} \cup S_1 \cup D_1$ and return M
-

tain the fraction $r_j(x)$ of committee members in the random forest that label each instance $x \in F_j$ as class 0. If there is high disagreement, that is $r_j(x) < 1 - \tau$, where τ is a given threshold, we identify x as lying in the overlap region and add it to the overlap set D_{01} . Across the k folds, each instance in D_0 gets evaluated for its potential of being in the overlap set D_{01} . The remaining majority instances are put in D_{00} which form the clear majority set. In Figure 3 the top left figure shows an original binary dataset with overlap points extracted. Note that the overlap points are nicely identified as being on the boundary of the majority and minority regions.

We take τ such that, the number of overlapped majority points = $\min(\text{number of minority points}, r\% \text{ of majority points})$. The r above is generator dependent and we find it by checking the performance on the validation set of a dataset with different r values (we used 3%, 5%, 7%, 9%) and use




Figure 2: CTabSyn for class conditional tabular data generation. We needed to make only a small change (highlighted in green) over existing TabSyn model to improve the quality of generations for imbalanced class distribution and benefit from our finer-grained class labels. Conditional diffusion is implemented by adding the true target embedding as input to denoiser for efficient sampling.

the best r value with all datasets for a given synthesizer.

4.2 Conditional Generators with Ternary Labels

Once we assigned finer-grained class labels to the original data D , we show in the experiment section that almost all existing deep generative models provided higher quality generators than training an identical model with binary labels. The only modification we made was to TabSyn (Zhang et al. 2024) one of the SOTA synthetic tabular data generation models which consists of a diffusion process modeled in a learnt latent space. The tabular data is first passed through a Variational auto-encoder which consists of a tokenizer that generates unique representations for each column which are then fed to a transformer to capture the intricate relations between the columns to obtain data in a continuous latent space instead of separately for numerical and categorical columns. This model does not support class conditional generation. We modified the TabSyn to support conditional generation and call this variant **CTabSyn**. The denoiser MLP which takes as input - a noisy version of data (x_{in}) and timestep (t) of the data now also has an embedding of the true target value (y) input to it.

$$\begin{aligned}
 t_emb &= \text{TimeEmbedding}(t) \\
 y_emb &= \text{Embedding}(y) \\
 x &= \text{Linear}(x_{in}) + t_emb + y_emb
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{1}$$

The overall architecture of CTabSyn is shown in Figure 2. CTabSyn with ORD considerably improves the performance of TabSyn as shown in Table 2.

5 Experiments

We present a detailed evaluation of the performance of ORD vis-a-vis several existing methods of generating synthetic data for training classifiers with imbalanced data. Our method is agnostic to the type of data generator and classifier, and we perform evaluation on five data generators and five different classifiers. More than the overall results, we dwell on the analysis of the reasons why ORD provides gains. Here we seek to answer questions like: Are ORD’s gains due to better quality synthetic data generated due to training with finer-grained ternary labels? Or, is the main

reason the selective under-sampling of majority points from the overlapping region?

Dataset	# Maj	# Min	# Unb Min	%Min/Maj
Adult	34514	11208	500	1.5
Heloc	5559	34979	700	2
Fintech	11560	11174	200	1.3
Cardio	35700	5000	100	1.8
Abalone	3076	265	265	8.6
Bank	31970	4198	4198	13.1
Car	1324	58	58	4.4
Yeast	1056	127	127	12

Table 1: Dataset details with count of original majority, original minority and the count of minority in the imbalanced setting with the Minority-Majority ratio for all datasets considered are depicted.

Datasets We evaluate our approach on eight real-world tabular datasets comprising a mix of numerical and categorical features, all with binary target variables. Four datasets—Adult, Heloc, Fintech Users, and Cardio—are originally less imbalanced. To simulate higher imbalance, we undersample the minority class to constitute only 1.5% to 2% of the total data. These datasets use a balanced test set for evaluation, while the training set is highly skewed.

Additionally, we use four inherently imbalanced UCI datasets—Abalone, Bank, Car, and Yeast—without introducing further skew. The test sets for these datasets retain their natural imbalance, reflecting real-world distributions. This combination of balanced and imbalanced test scenarios enables a comprehensive evaluation of the robustness and effectiveness of our method. The overall statistics of these datasets and their detailed descriptions including the number of D_{01} points for each threshold have been made available in the appendix.

Baselines Since ORD is an addendum over synthetic data generation models, we demonstrate the performance improvement it gives over five existing synthetic tabular data generation methods: **CTGAN**, **CTABGAN+**, **TabDDPM**, **ForestFlow** and **TabSyn**. In addition, from classical methods, we also include **SMOTE** and its popular variants i.e. **borderline SMOTE** (Han, Wang, and Mao 2005) and **AdaSyn**. (He et al. 2008)

Evaluation Metrics We follow standard practice for evaluating classifiers on imbalanced data and measure accuracy as the macro average of accuracy on **real** unseen minority and majority instances. This metric is also known as machine learning efficacy. We train five different classifiers: **XGBoost**, **Logistic Regression**, **Decision Tree**, **Multi-Layer Perceptron**, **AdaBoost**. However, to reduce clutter, we present accuracy grouped as follows: We separately report accuracy on XGBoost since it is generally the best-performing classification method for tabular data, and then we report the average accuracy over the remaining four classifiers. For the test set, we sampled 2000 of each class for the first 4 datasets since they were created by under-sampling




Figure 3: Visualisation of Synthetic data for ORD in 2D datasets. The first row shows data synthesized with ORD for different Synthesizers along with a clear indication of the overlap class D_{01} . The second row zooms only on sampled minority with wrong generations marked in pink from generators without ORD. The third row shows the same data but with ORD enhanced generators. The columns correspond to different generators. Particularly for the diffusion models (last two columns), ORD provides much fewer errors in generated examples than baseline diffusion models, which is already much higher quality than earlier GAN-based generators in columns 2 and 3.

from the original datasets. Since the test sets of the UCI datasets are also imbalanced, we additionally report the minority & majority accuracies, F1 scores and AUCROC in Table 10

Experimental Setup The code for all baseline synthesizers was obtained from their official GitHub repositories. All steps on environment creation, package installation, dataset pre-processing, training, and generation were followed as specified in the repository of the given baseline. Each baseline synthesizer underwent training and generation twice: Once with the original imbalanced dataset to synthesize D_0 and D_1 and once with the ORD processed imbalanced dataset to synthesize D_{00} , D_{01} and D_1 . For each dataset, an equal number of D_1 and D_0 synthetic points were used for training the classifier in the case of both with and without ORD. The reported numbers are an average over 3 runs of synthesizer training. We used $\tau=0.3$ for all real datasets and $\tau=0.2$ for the 2D toy datasets. The random forest for overlap detection had 50 trees while the other parameters were used at their default values. $k=2$ was sufficient for the k-fold training.

Visualization on 2D Toy Datasets We provide a better understanding of the working of our method via visualization of ORD on a 2D synthetic toy datasets. Detailed information on the creation of these datasets and minority-majority counts has been provided in the appendix. Dataset Blobs consists of four blobs that belong to the majority D_0

and three smaller blobs belonging to the minority D_1 . This was created using Scikit Learn Gaussian Blob generation.

Figure 3 top left corner shows the original majority instances (cyan) and minority instances (yellow), and the subset of majority that our method marked as Overlap points. In each of the subsequent plots, we show data generated by ORD using four different synthetic generators. First observe that recent diffusion models like TabSyn and ForestFlow (last two columns) provide higher quality generations as measured by their visual similarity to the original data. We zoom in further to highlight the difference between baseline generations and ORD generations. We assign to each generated minority point an error label based on the gold $P(y|x)$ model that is known in this toy setting. In the second row, we show the generated minority with wrong generations shown in pink from the baseline model. In the third row, we show the same for ORD variants of the generators. Observe that there are significantly fewer wrong generations from our ORD generators. We will later quantify the exact error of generation.

Overall Accuracy Comparison on real datasets In this section, we first report the main accuracy results for all synthesizers and how overall accuracy increases due to ORD in Table 2 and other metrics in Table 3 of the appendix. From these tables we can make the following important observations. (1) Our proposed ORD with CTabSyn, a conditional latent diffusion model, as a generator, provides the highest

Training Data	Adult		Cardio		Fintech		Heloc	
	Avg of 4	XGBoost	Avg of 4	XGBoost	Avg of 4	XGBoost	Avg of 4	XGBoost
Unbalanced, original	47.74	60.88	32.46	50.00	33.74	66.30	30.90	58.40
Smote	69.34	71.45	61.62	58.77	37.90	56.00	52.27	55.90
Borderline Smote	64.83	68.10	60.72	58.02	37.71	56.00	45.50	54.32
ADASYN	70.79	71.30	61.09	58.15	38.23	55.80	56.52	53.14
TabSyn	76.87	78.28	67.38	69.56	63.60	63.21	65.92	65.79
CTabSyn ORD	80.67	81.18	70.17	73.10	63.58	66.46	66.36	67.77
CTGAN	65.33	70.31	61.96	63.85	56.14	56.44	62.93	62.86
CTGAN ORD	72.81	74.52	64.90	66.33	57.58	58.38	61.47	62.34
CTAB-GAN+	77.06	78.09	68.97	57.33	57.45	59.40	56.26	54.77
CTAB-GAN+ ORD	78.90	79.72	69.74	61.46	54.83	57.66	63.82	65.03
ForestFlow	67.79	69.64	67.42	65.25	61.19	66.22	65.17	66.80
ForestFlow ORD	71.20	72.88	68.94	66.03	62.91	66.58	64.83	66.22
TabDDPM	69.55	69.76	64.91	64.02	61.88	60.50	52.10	60.70
TabDDPM ORD	77.92	78.33	66.87	68.77	63.07	57.80	63.22	61.30
TabSyn	76.87	78.28	67.38	69.56	63.60	63.21	65.92	65.79
CTabSyn	79.80	80.01	69.45	71.80	65.37	65.95	66.69	65.65
CTabSyn ORD	80.67	81.18	70.17	73.10	63.58	66.46	66.36	67.77

Table 2: Comparison of classification accuracy. First part focuses on existing imbalance handling baselines and our best method CTabSyn ORD. The next part shows an increase in accuracy for each individual synthesizer using ORD. Across 26 out of 32 (dataset, generative model) combinations we find that ORD provides a gain in accuracy.

accuracy across all four datasets and all classifiers. (2) Compared to the baseline classifier trained on original data D (first row of numbers), most synthetic data generation methods boost accuracy. The only exception is Fintech where only our methods provide gains. (3) If we replace the data generator from CTabSyn with any of the alternative generators, our ORD extension of training the generator and classifier, provides a boost in accuracy.

A paired T-test was performed on 5 synthesizers and 4 datasets with the balanced test sets, comparing accuracy with and without ORD. A p-value of $6.84e-05 < 0.05$ was obtained, **showing the statistical significance of ORD**.

We next investigate the reasons behind the gains that ORD provides over the respective baseline generative model. ORD impacts both the data synthesis step and the classifier training step. In subsequent experiments, we tease apart the contribution of each step in the overall accuracy gains.

ORD gains are due to better synthetic data generation.

We first demonstrate that generators G trained with ORD’s ternary labels provide better quality instances. We wanted to check the agreement in class label assigned by generator and true label of generated instances. However, the true label is not available for real data. So, we found two work arounds. First, for D we used a toy dataset where the true class distribution $P(y|x)$ is known. Table 3 shows the results on a mixture of Gaussian dataset as shown in Figure 3. Observe that in all cases minority accuracy is worse than majority, and recent diffusion based models like TabSyn and ForestFlow provide more accurate generations. Our extension ORD improves the minority accuracy even further in all cases, and also provides modest improvement for majority instances. Second, for experiments on real data, we trained an accurate XG Boost model on real balanced data. Note that this data is

not available to train the synthesizer, and is only used here to define an oracle. Table 4 shows overall accuracy of generated instances. Across all generators and datasets, we observe that our ORD variant generates instances with greater accuracy.

Model	Avg of Maj, Min (%)	Minority Acc. (%)	Majority Acc. (%)
CTabGan+	67.98	41.67	94.30
CTabGan+ ORD	70.52	46.08	94.95
DDPM	93.51	88.72	98.31
DDPM ORD	94.21	89.87	98.56
TabSyn	91.93	85.75	98.10
CTabSyn ORD	97.72	96.50	98.93
ForestFlow	95.68	91.90	99.47
ForestFlow ORD	95.74	92.02	99.46

Table 3: Accuracy of synthetic data label with true labels coming from the Bayes classifier. Minority data quality improves by the ORD method in most synthesizers. Since the generated data is mostly majority, Overall accuracy as the weighted avg. of majority and minority accuracies.

ORD trains a better classifier by downsampling overlapping majority

Note for training the classifier we only sample instances from clear majority and minority. We show that this is another reason why ORD leads to higher classification accuracy. We disentangle the effect of the quality of synthetic instances by training classifiers on real dataset. We train two classifiers: the first is trained on the entire dataset - D_0 and D_1 while second is trained in ORD mode where we remove the instances from D_0 that falls in the overlap re-

Model	Adult	Cardio	Fintech	Heloc
CTGAN	67.94	70.89	55.22	54.84
CTGAN ORD	67.24	64.38	56.36	53.97
CTAB-GAN+	54.54	68.08	53.69	52.84
CTAB-GAN+ ORD	77.06	70.48	50.92	49.80
TabDDPM	75.38	59.35	65.83	49.80
TabDDPM ORD	77.36	73.60	61.53	73.82
TabSyn	67.19	69.22	60.73	63.86
CTabSyn ORD	72.64	72.07	65.97	66.91
ForestFlow	69.78	73.49	77.12	74.01
ForestFlow ORD	70.21	73.54	72.42	73.23

Table 4: Accuracy of testing synthetic data on a classifier trained on real **balanced** datasets. An increase with ORD shows how synthesis is improved by ORD.

gion. We show the results in Table 5 and observe that overall accuracy increases with removing Overlap majority points in most cases.

Metric	Accuracy (%)	Minority Accuracy (%)	Majority Accuracy (%)
Adult	76.23	57.06	95.40
Adult ORD	81.57	75.68	87.45
Fintech	69.25	54.27	85.60
Fintech ORD	72.97	76.77	69.16
Heloc	71.04	65.95	76.14
Heloc ORD	70.55	84.56	56.52

Table 5: Effect of removing Overlap i.e. D_{01} on real data is shown in this table. The improvement shows that removing D_{01} helps classifier to learn better decision boundary.

Ablations We perform another interesting ablation to show that ORD directly affects the synthetic data generator and not just the classifier. Here we compare ORD with an ablation where we directly use D to train the generators, sample D_0 and D_1 from them, and then remove overlap instances from D_0 . Table 6 presents a comparison of accuracy of the XGBoost classifier trained using the synthetic data in the two settings. We observe that for two of the datasets — Adult and Heloc, the accuracy drops by a huge amount when the filtering of overlapping instances is done after training the generator on binary labels. This is another evidence to support our claim that the finer-grained ternary labels leads to a better quality generator. In Table 2 we did not include the real minority instances to train the classifier to enable fair comparison across all methods. We have found that, out of the various possible augmentation combinations, augmenting the synthetic data with only the minority class D_1 original data points provides the greatest gains. The results are tabulated in Table 7. We present more ablations in the supplementary.

Dataset	ORD Before Synthesis (%)	ORD After Synthesis (%)
Adult	79.19	65.32
Heloc	67.00	44.72
Fintech	60.19	60.90
Cardio	72.04	72.31

Table 6: Comparison of XGBoost Accuracy of ORD done Before and After Synthesis shows that ORD aids Synthesis. It shows that not just removing overlap for the classifier but also providing that information to the synthesizer is necessary.

Training Data	Adult (%)	Fintech (%)	Heloc (%)	Cardio (%)
Real Unbalanced	46.52	25.87	31.04	32.46
Synthetic ORD	78.30	60.52	65.74	63.81
Synthetic ORD + D_1	79.15	63.92	67.40	65.62

Table 7: Effect of augmenting synthetic data with real minority data D_1 . There is an improvement in classification accuracy. The Classifier used is an Average of 4 classifiers LR, MLP, DT and Adaboost.

6 Conclusion, Limitations, Future work

In this paper, we proposed ORD, a new technique for training classifiers with highly imbalanced class distribution for augmenting with synthetic data from generative models. A key idea of ORD is identifying overlapping majority instances and converting the original binary labels into a ternary labeled dataset. We show that existing deep generative models are also adversely affected by imbalance in training data, and show that class conditional generators trained with our ternary labels provide higher quality data. Finally, ORD under-samples overlapping majority instances and trains the classifier using balanced synthetic minority and clear majority instances along with real minorities. We present a detailed comparison on four real datasets and obtain improvement in classification accuracy in most settings. We explain the reasons behind the gains via three insightful experiments that show that ORD improves both the data synthesis step and the classifier training step.

Limitations and Future Works (1) The method proposed is for datasets having binary class target columns only. However, with some tweaking, there is a possibility of extending this method to datasets with multi-class categorical target columns. (2) While the method has been shown to work on datasets with highly imbalanced categorical columns, it will be interesting to extend to datasets with continuous-valued target columns with a very skewed distribution. (3) The focus of this work is not privacy preservation but an interesting extension is to train the data generator without compromising privacy of the real data.

Acknowledgments Work done in this project was funded by the State Bank of India (SBI) Data Analytics Hub at IIT Bombay. We thank SBI data scientists for introducing us to

the problem. We acknowledge discussions with Dr Rajbabu in initial phases of the project.

References

- Adiputra, I. N. M.; and Wanchai, P. 2023. CTGAN-ENN: A tabular GAN-based Hybrid Sampling Method for Imbalanced and Overlapped Data in Customer Churn Prediction.
- Borisov, V.; Sessler, K.; Leemann, T.; Pawelczyk, M.; and Kasneci, G. 2023. Language Models are Realistic Tabular Data Generators. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Breiman, L. 2001. Random forests. *Machine learning*, 45: 5–32.
- Chawla, N. V.; Bowyer, K. W.; Hall, L. O.; and Kegelmeyer, W. P. 2002. SMOTE: Synthetic Minority Over-sampling Technique. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 16: 321–357.
- Chen, T.; and Guestrin, C. 2016. Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system. In *Proceedings of the 22nd acm sigkdd international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, 785–794.
- Douzas, G.; Bacao, F.; and Last, F. 2018. Improving imbalanced learning through a heuristic oversampling method based on k-means and SMOTE. *Information Sciences*, 465: 1–20.
- Gulati, M. S.; and Roysdon, P. F. 2023. TabMT: Generating tabular data with masked transformers. arXiv:2312.06089.
- Han, H.; Wang, W.-Y.; and Mao, B.-H. 2005. Borderline-SMOTE: a new over-sampling method in imbalanced data sets learning. In *International conference on intelligent computing*, 878–887. Springer.
- He, H.; Bai, Y.; Garcia, E. A.; and Li, S. 2008. ADASYN: Adaptive synthetic sampling approach for imbalanced learning. In *2008 IEEE international joint conference on neural networks (IEEE world congress on computational intelligence)*, 1322–1328. Ieee.
- Hegselmann, S.; Buendia, A.; Lang, H.; Agrawal, M.; Jiang, X.; and Sontag, D. 2023. Tabllm: Few-shot classification of tabular data with large language models. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 5549–5581. PMLR.
- Johnson, J. M.; and Khoshgoftaar, T. M. 2019. Survey on deep learning with class imbalance. *Journal of big data*, 6(1): 1–54.
- Jolicoeur-Martineau, A.; Fatras, K.; and Kachman, T. 2024. Generating and imputing tabular data via diffusion and flow-based gradient-boosted trees. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 1288–1296. PMLR.
- Kotelnikov, A.; Baranchuk, D.; Rubachev, I.; and Babenko, A. 2022. TabDDPM: Modelling Tabular Data with Diffusion Models. arXiv:2209.15421.
- Leng, Q.; Guo, J.; Tao, J.; Meng, X.; and Wang, C. 2024. OBMI: oversampling borderline minority instances by a two-stage Tomek link-finding procedure for class imbalance problem. *Complex & Intelligent Systems*, 1–18.
- Li, Z.; Huang, M.; Liu, G.; and Jiang, C. 2021. A hybrid method with dynamic weighted entropy for handling the problem of class imbalance with overlap in credit card fraud detection. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 175: 114750.
- Mathew, J.; Luo, M.; Pang, C. K.; and Chan, H. L. 2015. Kernel-based SMOTE for SVM classification of imbalanced datasets. In *IECON 2015 - 41st Annual Conference of the IEEE Industrial Electronics Society*, 001127–001132.
- Papamakarios, G.; Pavlakou, T.; and Murray, I. 2017. Masked autoregressive flow for density estimation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Vaswani, A. 2017. Attention is all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.03762*.
- Vuttipittayamongkol, P.; and Elyan, E. 2020. Neighbourhood-based undersampling approach for handling imbalanced and overlapped data. *Information Sciences*, 509: 47–70.
- Wang, Z.; Wu, C.; Zheng, K.; Niu, X.; and Wang, X. 2019. SMOTETomek-based resampling for personality recognition. *IEEE access*, 7: 129678–129689.
- Xu, L.; Skoularidou, M.; Cuesta-Infante, A.; and Veeramachaneni, K. 2019. Modeling Tabular data using Conditional GAN. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Zhang, H.; Zhang, J.; Srinivasan, B.; Shen, Z.; Qin, X.; Faloutsos, C.; Rangwala, H.; and Karypis, G. 2024. Mixed-Type Tabular Data Synthesis with Score-based Diffusion in Latent Space. arXiv:2310.09656.
- Zhang, Y.-P.; Zhang, L.-N.; and Wang, Y.-C. 2010. Cluster-based majority under-sampling approaches for class imbalance learning. In *2010 2nd IEEE International Conference on Information and Financial Engineering*, 400–404. IEEE.
- Zhao, X.; Guan, S.; Xue, Y.; and Pan, H. 2024. HS-CGK: A Hybrid Sampling Method for Imbalance Data Based on Conditional Tabular Generative Adversarial Network and K-Nearest Neighbor Algorithm. *Computing and Informatics*, 43(1): 213–239.
- Zhao, Z.; Birke, R.; and Chen, L. 2023. TabuLa: Harnessing Language Models for Tabular Data Synthesis. arXiv:2310.12746.
- Zhao, Z.; Kunar, A.; Birke, R.; and Chen, L. Y. 2022. CTAB-GAN+: Enhancing Tabular Data Synthesis. arXiv:2204.00401.
- Zhao, Z.; Kunar, A.; der Scheer, H. V.; Birke, R.; and Chen, L. Y. 2021. CTAB-GAN: Effective Table Data Synthesizing. *CoRR*, abs/2102.08369.
- Zhou, Z.-H.; and Liu, X.-Y. 2005. Training cost-sensitive neural networks with methods addressing the class imbalance problem. *IEEE Transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, 18(1): 63–77.

A System Specifications and Complexity Analysis

A.1 Hardware and Software used

GPU/CPU Models

CPU: Intel(R) Xeon(R) Platinum 8160 CPU @ 2.10GHz

GPU: NVIDIA RTX A6000

Memory

CPU: 1.5 TiB

GPU: 49140 MiB

Operating System: Linux

Software Libraries and Frameworks

pandas	2.2.2
numpy	2.0.0
matplotlib	3.9.0
scikit-learn	1.5.0
scipy	1.13.1
sdmatrix	0.14.1

A.2 Complexity Analysis

The primary computation in ORD is training an ensemble of classifiers and obtaining confidence scores. The complexity of the synthetic data generation depends on the deep generative model used (not part of ORD). We have tried real-world datasets with a large number of features and samples. Our method scales well even upto 200 features and dataset sizes upto 250,000 taking 900s and 350s respectively. Details tabulated in the Table 8 and Table 9.

num samples	num features	Time (s)
50000	20	90.473581
50000	50	164.960408
50000	100	246.302797
50000	200	351.647613

Table 8: Execution time for ORD preprocessing increasing number of features while keeping the number of samples fixed at 50,000.

num samples	num features	Time (s)
10000	30	18.172544
50000	30	115.197481
100000	30	257.074255
200000	30	568.373154
300000	30	911.999833

Table 9: Execution time for ORD preprocessing increasing dataset size while keeping the number of features fixed at 30.

B Measures of variation for the main table

For the table computing machine learning efficacy for 4 datasets on 5 synthesizers with and without ORD, we compute the standard deviation over 3 runs sampling with multiple seeds during each run. The results are tabulated in Table 11.

C Ablation study and further experiments

C.1 Not a trivial boundary shifter

Since we showed that the method of conditioning creates a decluttered boundary for the minority class points, one might think that this could be synonymous with shifting the classification boundary towards the majority class examples, thus increasing minority class accuracy while reducing majority class accuracy. We strike out this assumption with the following experiment.

We split the original dataset D into train and test sets, D_{train} and D_{test} , respectively. We train an XGBoost classifier Clf on D_{train} and obtain the class probability values on the test set D_{test} . Now we obtain the scores on the test set using different values of thresholds (essentially lowering it so that the classification boundary shifts more towards the majority class). We find the threshold for which we get the best scores and compare these scores with the scores obtained by our method of ORD and observe that in most cases, the method of **ORD outperforms the shifting threshold method**. Thus, this shows that ORD is non-trivial and is not analogous to simply shifting the classifier boundary. The results are tabulated in Table 12.

C.2 Augmentation for further improvement

When privacy is not a concern, the original data augmented with synthetic data results in the training of a better classifier. We have found that, out of the various possible augmentation combinations, augmenting the synthetic data with only the minority class D_1 original data points improves machine learning efficacy (MLE). The results are tabulated in Table 16 and Table 17.

D Experimenting with different thresholds

D.1 Number of overlapped instances for different thresholds

It is obvious that when the threshold τ is high of the order of 0.4 or 0.45, we get very little overlapped class D_{01} points. But on the other hand, if it is too low like 0.15 or 0.2, only the instances with Majority confidence above 0.8 or 0.85 get into Clear Majority D_{00} . This relationship is demonstrated for Adult and Cardio datasets by the Table 13 and shown in the Figure 6

D.2 Machine Learning Efficacy varying with thresholds

We converted the binary target to ternary label dataset with different thresholds ranging from 0.2 to 0.45 and then repeated the MLE experiment. It is found that different thresholds are best suited for different datasets. Use of Validation data for best threshold decision was discussed in main paper. A threshold of 0.3 or 0.35 works best for Adult and Cardio with extreme imbalance considered. Further study on the Machine Learning Efficacy is presented in Table 14 for data Adult and Table 15 for data Cardio.

Observations are that, Machine learning efficacy improves until an optimal threshold and then decreases again.

Dataset	Synthesizer	Avg of 4	XGBoost	Min Acc (%)	Maj Acc (%)	F1	AUCROC
Abalone	CTAB-GAN+	23.21	63.16	62.86	63.19	22.22	67.96
	CTAB-GAN+ ORD	23.11	56.10	80.00	53.92	23.38	74.03
	ForestFlow	39.34	83.97	61.43	86.03	39.09	84.16
	ForestFlow ORD	38.65	82.18	67.14	83.55	38.68	84.57
Bank	CTAB-GAN+	45.71	82.61	62.14	85.41	46.30	83.10
	CTAB-GAN+ ORD	84.45	79.61	75.16	80.22	47.07	85.36
	ForestFlow	50.02	88.29	74.61	90.17	60.49	92.06
	ForestFlow ORD	51.30	88.78	70.85	91.23	60.37	91.66
Car	CTAB-GAN+	7.02	52.60	54.55	52.54	6.82	55.01
	CTAB-GAN+ ORD	13.64	61.27	100.00	60.00	14.10	84.15
	ForestFlow	37.42	95.38	100.00	95.22	57.89	98.56
	ForestFlow ORD	38.59	96.53	100.00	96.42	64.70	98.67
Yeast	CTAB-GAN+	33.76	52.91	38.85	72.22	23.53	57.01
	CTAB-GAN+ ORD	39.14	55.07	86.11	50.77	31.79	74.76
	ForestFlow	75.99	93.58	80.56	95.38	75.30	97.00
	ForestFlow ORD	76.00	92.23	86.11	93.08	76.94	96.36

Table 10: Metrics for UCI datasets Abalone, Bank, Car and Yeast include F1 score and AUC since the test sets are imbalanced. The minority increase is considerable in all datasets while F1 improves in with ORD in all cases while AUC shows an improvement in 6 out of 8 cases.

Model	AI		Cardio		Fintech		Heloc	
	Avg of 4	XGBoost	Avg of 4	XGBoost	Avg of 4	XGBoost	Avg of 4	XGBoost
CTGAN	0.01	0.73	0.01	1.35	0.01	1.11	0.01	0.74
CTGAN ORD	0.01	1.08	0.00	1.40	0.01	0.89	0.01	0.56
CTAB-GAN+	0.65	0.44	0.19	2.11	1.07	0.25	0.66	1.45
CTAB-GAN+ ORD	0.80	0.95	0.80	2.02	0.90	2.14	1.17	0.92
Forest	0.53	1.28	0.25	0.73	1.50	0.13	1.34	0.87
Forest ORD	1.13	1.35	0.58	0.88	0.13	0.84	1.89	1.04
TabDDPM	0.09	0.95	0.02	1.00	0.10	0.90	0.01	1.08
TabDDPM ORD	0.02	0.18	0.02	0.33	0.03	0.27	0.07	0.64
TabSyn	0.36	2.15	0.84	1.19	0.48	0.61	0.61	0.59
CTabSyn	0.58	0.27	0.68	0.36	0.39	0.34	0.40	0.60
CTabSyn ORD	0.25	0.12	0.65	0.36	0.26	0.36	0.58	0.33

Table 11: For Machine learning efficacy (accuracy of classifier trained with synthetic data) reported in main paper, the following is the Standard deviation over 3 runs.

MLE of Adult with different thresholds




Figure 4: MLE of dataset Adult with varying thresholds during ORD

MLE of Cardio with different thresholds




Figure 5: MLE of dataset cardio with varying thresholds during ORD

Dataset	Score at 0.5 (%)	Best Threshold	Best Score (%)
Adult	80.12	0.48	80.25
Adult ORD	80.60	0.45	81.02
Fintech	60.75	0.45	61.70
Fintech ORD	62.20	0.45	62.64
Heloc	44.82	0.45	66.45
Heloc ORD	66.45	0.50	66.45
Cardio	72.52	0.49	72.58
Cardio ORD	72.75	0.50	72.75

Table 12: Results show that best threshold for ORD is always better than best for that of no ORD. ORD is hence not a trivial boundary shifter.

Threshold	Adult	Cardio
0.20	915	1801
0.25	493	1019
0.30	355	700
0.35	192	330
0.40	151	205
0.45	79	93

Table 13: The effect of varying thresholds on the number of majority points in the overlap region. Even though the original dataset has a similar sizes, the difference in overlapped points for the same threshold indicates the intrinsic difference in the overlap region of the original dataset as shown in Figure 6

There are instances where more than one threshold is suitable for a given dataset.

E Experiment with 2D Toy

make_blobs from the `sklearn.datasets` library was used for creating the toy dataset. num_{maj} points were equally distributed among n_{maj} blobs while num_{min} points were equally distributed among n_{min} blobs. num_{maj} , num_{min} , n_{maj} , n_{min} , the centres and standard deviations of all the blobs have been provided in the Table 18.

A visualisation of toy 1 is present in main paper. The visualisation of toy 2 is presented in Figure 8. A visualisation of the toy for different thresholds showing different boundary points is shown in Figure 7

Since the centers and standard deviation of the blobs are known, we approximate the accuracy of the synthetic data using simple Naive Bayes using a Mixture of Gaussians (MoG) of the blobs of the same class.

$$\begin{aligned}
 P(y = 1|X) &= P(X|y = 1)P(y = 1)/P(X) \\
 P(y = 0|X) &= P(X|y = 0)P(y = 0)/P(X) \\
 f(X) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } P(y = 1|X) > P(y = 0|X) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2)
 \end{aligned}$$




Figure 6: Varying thresholds changes the number of D_{01} points in the dataset after applying overlap detection. The exact numbers are reported in Table 13




Figure 7: Toy 2 visualisation showing ORD on different thresholds and the overlapped majority in a different color.

Threshold	Adult, CTABGAN+				Adult, ForestFlow			
	Avg of 4	XGBoost	Min acc	Maj acc	Avg of 4	XGBoost	Min acc	Maj acc
0.20	74.63	79.00	73.00	85.00	73.24	74.68	64.30	85.05
0.25	79.06	79.73	76.80	82.65	67.20	75.00	69.45	80.55
0.30	78.69	78.88	73.65	84.10	67.87	75.78	67.15	84.40
0.35	75.06	76.43	66.20	86.65	0.70	76.53	72.10	80.95
0.40	72.30	70.68	76.05	65.30	68.41	73.20	61.20	85.20
0.45	70.63	74.43	69.30	79.55	69.80	73.25	66.65	79.85

Table 14: Varying Thresholds while detecting overlap and measuring MLE for Adult data. Machine Learning efficacy experiment with Average of 4 classifiers LR, MLP, Adaboost and DT from SD Metrics along with XGBoost classifier. XGboost classifier’s minority and majority accuracy is also noted to see if minority increases well. Found 0.3 to be the best threshold for Adult dataset.

Threshold	Cardio, CTABGAN+				Cardio, ForestFlow			
	Avg of 4	XGBoost	Min acc	Maj acc	Avg of 4	XGBoost	Min acc	Maj acc
0.20	72.16	69.90	80.28	59.49	67.39	68.25	61.16	75.36
0.25	71.81	71.48	76.29	66.65	67.04	66.05	60.61	71.51
0.30	71.01	70.55	74.54	66.55	67.21	67.90	63.21	72.61
0.35	71.17	67.60	80.58	54.58	66.28	67.07	58.36	75.81
0.40	71.37	70.30	79.58	60.99	65.62	61.65	71.59	51.68
0.45	70.28	65.23	87.47	42.91	65.80	66.63	58.76	74.51

Table 15: Varying Thresholds while detecting overlap and measuring MLE for Cardio data. Machine Learning efficacy experiment with Average of 4 classifiers LR, MLP, Adaboost and DT from SD Metrics and XGBoost classifier. XGboost classifier’s minority and majority accuracy is also noted to see if minority increases well. Found lower thresholds than 0.35 to be the optimal ones for Cardio dataset.

F Experiment with 1D Toy

F.1 Experimentation with 1D gaussian

The following experiment was conducted to demonstrate why the ORD method works i.e. why adding information about a third (overlapped majority) class benefits the minority class and enables us to learn a better distribution for it. The experiment was as follows:

- Created a 1D dataset consisting of 2 classes (majority and minority) sampled from mixture of gaussians. The densities of the minority and majority classes created have been given in Figure 9.
- For the given distribution, the ORD points i.e. the overlapping majority points were detected using Naive Bayes probability of the majority class belonging to the majority and the minority classes. The resulting density has been displayed in Figure 10.

$$\begin{aligned}
 P(y = 1|X) &= P(X|y = 1)P(y = 1)/P(X) \\
 P(y = 0|X) &= P(X|y = 0)P(y = 0)/P(X) \\
 f(X) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } P(y = 1|X) > P(y = 0|X) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3)
 \end{aligned}$$

- For learning the distributions of the two class as well as the three class case, the X axis of the distribution is divided into 100 bins (hyper parameter), and the classes of the centers of each bin are learnt i.e. the probabilities of the center of each bin belonging to the majority/ minority class is learnt.

- To show the effect of including a classifier loss in learning the distribution, we first train a logistic regression model on all the input points and their true labels separately for the two-class and three-class cases.
- Then, we include a term of the loss of the logistic regression classifier when learning the probabilities of the centers of each bin.

The learned distributions of each of the cases above have been displayed in figure 11. The main observations are as follows:

- Even in the absence of a classifier, when three classes are used instead of two, it can be observed that the majority distribution is pushed away from the minority distribution
- Upon using a classifier, irrespective of the 2 classes or 3 classes case, the probability of the minority class in regions away from the bulk minority increases.
- Upon using three classes and a classifier loss, we see that the majority class is pushed away more than in the case of not using classifier loss. Also, the increase in the minority class probability in regions away from the minority bulk is more in the three classes case.

Thus, the above experiment demonstrates the effectiveness of the ORD method in models that contain a classifier loss.

Preliminary Results

- We observe that when a constraint is given during sampling, irrespective of the number of columns constrained

Data	Adult, CTABGAN+				Adult, ForestFlow			
	Avg of 4	XGboost	Min acc	Maj acc	Avg of 4	XGboost	Min acc	Maj acc
$S_{00} \cup S_1$	78.96	79.73	76.80	82.65	67.46	75.00	69.45	80.55
$S_{00} \cup S_1 \cup \text{subsample}(S_{01})$	74.67	76.33	66.40	86.25	63.67	69.27	53.35	85.20
$S_{00} \cup S_1 \cup D_1$	79.57	81.18	80.35	82.00	78.08	70.45	98.50	42.40
$S_{00} \cup S_1 \cup D_1 \cup \text{subsample}(D_0)$	79.83	81.83	78.15	85.50	77.38	84.23	74.80	93.65

Table 16: The results of 2 synthesizers - CTabGAN+ and ForestFlow are shown on the Adult Dataset. Here, we see that the best minority accuracy without a loss in majority accuracy is obtained in the case where the synthetic data is augmented with real minority class data. While augmenting synthetic data with real minority class data and some portion of real majority class data gives the best overall accuracy (though not necessarily the best minority class accuracy)

Data	Cardio, CTABGAN+				Cardio, ForestFlow			
	Avg of 4	XGboost	Min acc	Maj acc	Avg of 4	XGboost	Min acc	Maj acc
$S_{00} \cup S_1$	70.27	72.32	67.15	77.50	68.62	67.15	69.75	64.55
$S_{00} \cup S_1 \cup \text{subsample}(S_{01})$	67.39	70.35	58.40	82.30	63.30	60.22	55.00	65.45
$S_{00} \cup S_1 \cup D_1$	79.58	81.18	80.35	82.00	69.60	67.04	78.82	55.25
$S_{00} \cup S_1 \cup D_1 \cup \text{subsample}(D_0)$	79.83	81.83	78.15	85.50	72.00	80.90	66.60	95.20

Table 17: The results of 2 synthesizers - CTabGAN+ and ForestFlow are shown on the Cardio Dataset. The conclusions of this table are the same as those in Table 16




Figure 8: Toy 2 visualisation

Data	#blobs	num	Centers	Std. Dev.
Majority 1	4	8K	[-30,-30], [20,40], [0,0], [40,-50]	[3, 4, 10, 6]
Minority 1	3	0.5K	[0,-30], [25,20], [20,-50]	[4, 6, 4]
Majority 2	3	7.5K	[10,10], [-30,-20], [40,-50]	[10, 8, 4]
Minority 2	2	0.2K	[-30,10], [20,-20]	[10,4]

Table 18: 2 different toy datasets are created with differing number of majority and minority blobs. First toy has been tabulated in the main paper while second toy results are present in Table 19.

Model	Avg of Maj, Min (%)	Minority Acc. (%)	Majority Acc. (%)
CTabGan+	54.48	15.25	93.70
CTabGan+ ORD	61.55	27.42	95.67
DDPM	89.66	79.68	99.64
DDPM ORD	91.42	83.16	99.68
TabSyn	85.63	71.59	99.67
CTabSyn ORD	86.21	73.02	99.4
ForestFlow	87.02	74.4	99.64
ForestFlow ORD	89.33	78.87	99.78

Table 19: Accuracy of synthetic data (Blobs2) label with true labels from the Bayes classifier. Minority data quality improves by the ORD method in most synthesizers.

on or whether they are categorical or numerical, the generated samples strictly follow the constraints. Thus, constraint success rate is 100%

- To check the quality of our constrained sampled data, we use SDMetrics to check the *column shapes* and *column pair relations* between the real dataset filtered on those constraints and sampled data 1) with constraints and 2) without constraints filtered on the constraints. Refer to ?? for the numbers. It can be observed that in most cases, the constrained data has equal to or better values than the unconstrained data with having slightly worse values in very few cases.

G Real Datasets

Eight popular datasets were used for experimental purposes. First four datasets namely - Adult, Cardio (Cardiovascular Disease dataset), HELOC (Home Equity Line of Credit), and Fintech Users. The Adult dataset was taken from UCI Machine Learning Repository² while the other three datasets

²<https://archive.ics.uci.edu/datasets>




Figure 9: The distribution of the 1D mixture of Gaussians




Figure 10: The distribution of the 1D mixture of Gaussians with the overlap majority class detected

were taken from Kaggle³. The next four are UCI imbalanced datasets - Abalone, Car Evaluation and Bank Marketing. The statistics of these datasets have been presented in Table 1.

Dataset	# Rows	# Cat	# Num	Min/Maj%
Adult	34514	8	5	1.5
Heloc	5559	7	16	1.9
Fintech	11560	19	9	1.8
Cardio	35700	6	5	2
Abalone	4177	1	6	8.6
Bank	45211	8	6	13.1
Car	1728	5	-	4.4
Yeast	1484	1	6	12

Table 20: Dataset Characteristics. The #Cat column denotes the number of categorical columns, and #Real denotes the number of real columns. In each case, we used 2000 unseen examples each from majority and minority for testing. The percentage of minority points considered for each dataset is between 1.4%-2%

The detailed descriptions for each data set are as follows:

Adult⁴: This dataset contains demographic and employment-related features of people (Zhang et al. 2024). The objective is predicting whether income exceeds \$50K/yr based on census data. This dataset is also known as "Census Income" dataset.

Cardio⁵ (Cardiovascular Disease dataset): This dataset

³<https://www.kaggle.com/datasets>

⁴<https://archive.ics.uci.edu/dataset/2/adult>

⁵<https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/sulianova/cardiovascular-disease-dataset>




Figure 11: The outputs of using 2 classes and 3 classes and with and without a classifier loss

contains objective information i.e. factual information, subjective information i.e. information given by patients and results of medical examinations.

Fintech⁶: This dataset contains the financial and demographic data of fintech company users, to improve the sales of the company. The objective of this dataset is classifying whether a customer will purchase something next time or not, also known as customer churn prediction. The objective of this dataset is to predict the presence or absence of disease.

HELOC⁷ (**Home Equity Line of Credit**): Each entry in the dataset is a line of credit, typically offered by a bank as a percentage of home equity (the difference between the current market value of a home and its purchase price). The objective of this dataset is to predict whether a given line of credit is at risk or not.

Yeast⁸: The dataset target variable predicts the cellular localisation sites of proteins. It is a classification dataset in the Biology domain, a popular imbalanced dataset from UCI.

Abalone⁹: In the dataset, the age of abalone is determined by cutting the shell through the cone, staining it, and counting the number of rings through a microscope – a boring and time-consuming task. Other measurements, which are easier to obtain, are used to predict the age.

Bank¹⁰: The data is related with direct marketing campaigns of a Portuguese banking institution. The marketing campaigns were based on phone calls. Often, more than one contact to the same client was required, in order to access if the product (bank term deposit) would be ('yes') or not ('no') subscribed.

⁶<https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/niketdheeryan/fintech-users-data>

⁷<https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/averkiyoliabev/home-equity-line-of-creditheloc>

⁸<https://archive.ics.uci.edu/dataset/110/yeast>

⁹<https://archive.ics.uci.edu/dataset/1/abalone>

¹⁰<https://archive.ics.uci.edu/dataset/222/bank+marketing>

Car¹¹: Car Evaluation dataset derived from simple hierarchical decision model, is useful for testing constructive induction and structure discovery methods. Target is to evaluate the car : Unacceptable, Acceptable, Good or Very Good.

Apart from that, most synthesizer methods mentioned in the Section H use these datasets. This is the reason behind using the first 4 datasets for our experiments. The next 4 datasets are popular UCI datasets with an inherent imbalance whereas the first 4 datasets are imbalanced by sampling.

G.1 Preprocessing

In case of datasets with categorical columns that are not of datatype *int* or *float*, the categorical columns need to first be label encoded to get columns of dtype *int*. ORD method is applied on this encoded dataset to obtain the ORD column. Once the ORD column is obtained, one can replace the target column from the original (non-processed) dataset with the ORD column to get the ORD dataset. Then depending upon which synthesizer is being used, the pre-processing of the dataset will be done as specified for that model/ synthesizer.

H Synthesizers

Among the many different methods of generation of Tabular data, there are some broad class categories: SMOTE and its variants, GAN methods, Diffusion methods, Flow based methods and LLM and Transformer methods. The current state of the art are diffusion and GAN methods closely followed by LLM based methods.

We demonstrated the effectiveness of ORD on five deep data generators, namely - CTGAN, CTabGAN+, TabDDPM, TabSyn and ForestFlow in our paper. We used the official GitHub implementation of each of these synthesizers. All of these generator are current/ past SOTA models and we provide a short description of each of them as follows:

¹¹<https://archive.ics.uci.edu/dataset/19/car+evaluation>

CTGAN¹²: This model introduced mode specific normalization and conditional vectors for training and sampling. CTGAN consists of a conditional GAN. During training, it randomly samples a discrete column based on its log frequency and learns the distribution conditioned on a label of the sampled column. The model penalizes the cross-entropy loss between the true label and the generated label.

CTabGAN+¹³: It is an improvement over CTabGAN which itself is an improvement over CTGAN. It consists of extra preprocessing for mixed data types, long tailed distributions and contains an additional classifier component in the loss to learn better distributions.

TabDDPM¹⁴: It is a diffusion based synthetic data generation model. As all diffusion models, TabDDPM too consists of a forward and reverse diffusion process. Herein, the numerical columns are modeled by the usual Gaussian distribution process while the the categorical columns are modeled by a Multinomial diffusion process. Each column has a separate forward diffusion process while the reverse diffusion for all columns takes place together via an MLP (Multi Layer Perceptron). For each of the categorical columns, which are one hot encoded before passing through the forward diffusion process, the output of the MLP is passed through a Softmax activation which produces a probability distribution over all the classes in a column

TabSyn¹⁵: This model consists of a diffusion process modeled in a learnt latent space. The tabular data is first passed through a Variational auto-encoder which consists of a tokenizer that generates unique representations for each column which are then fed to a transformer to capture the intricate relations between the columns to obtain data in a continuous latent space instead of separately for numerical and categorical columns. The VAE is trained with a loss function involving a reconstruction term between the input and generated data and a KL divergence term which regularizes the mean and variance of the latent space. The data in the latent space is then learn via a diffusion process and the data obtained from the reverse diffusion process is modeled back to the original space using the decoder part of the VAE.

ForestFlow¹⁶: It is a diffusion-based model which instead of using an MLP to model the reverse diffusion process as is normally done, uses a ensemble of XGBoost models, a separate one for each discrete column and each noise level.

H.1 Smote and its variants

SMOTE (Chawla et al. 2002) was the first attempt in handling unbalanced data. It considered minority points and interpolated the minority points with its same class neighbors. There are variations of SMOTE namely BorderlineSMOTE (Han, Wang, and Mao 2005), ADASYN (He et al. 2008) etc. which build upon the interpolation concept considering the neighbors of the minority class points. There are Kernel SMOTE for SVM classifiers (Mathew et al. 2015)

¹²<https://github.com/sdv-dev/CTGAN>

¹³<https://github.com/Team-TUD/CTAB-GAN-Plus>

¹⁴<https://github.com/yandex-research/tab-ddpm>

¹⁵<https://github.com/amazon-science/tabsyn>

¹⁶<https://github.com/SamsungSAILMontreal/ForestDiffusion>

and K Means SMOTE (Douzas, Bacao, and Last 2018) which also uses clustering before interpolating like the other SMOTE Methods.

H.2 Generative Adversarial Networks

GANs gained increased popularity in the image generation domain. GAN (Generative Adversarial Network) has a Generator and Discriminator which work as adversaries to each other. The generator objective is to generate indistinguishable images as real data and the discriminator's objective is to identify the real and synthetic data. The tabular data generation posed certain challenges compared to image generation. The data type of columns varied from categorical to numerical requiring different preprocessing and handling steps. The continuous data columns were not simple gaussian and could not be efficiently represented by a minmax normalization and required gaussian mixture models suited for multimodal data. With these GMMs, the problem of mode collapse becomes prominent. The first breakthrough in Tabular data generation through the GAN model was through CTGAN. (Xu et al. 2019) This model introduced mode specific normalization and conditional vectors for training in sampling. This method handled imbalanced data well compared to SMOTE and other interpolation methods. The CTABGAN was an improvement over CTGAN which added extra preprocessing for mixed data types, long tailed distributions and an additional classifier component to aid better performance (Zhao et al. 2021). The CTABGAN+ is yet another improvement on CTABGAN which is currently the best method for Tabular Synthetic Data generation from imbalanced data.(Zhao et al. 2022) Some techniques used in GAN based methods are summarized as follows:

Mode Specific Normalization Most continuous valued attributes are multimodal in a tabular data. The mode collapse problem becomes prominent in this case and we preclude it by a method called mode specific normalization. The method includes

- Construct a Variation Gaussian Mixture model and find m modes in the column.
- For every point, find the mode to which it belongs with maximum probability and find the one hot encoded beta vector of modes.
- Normalize the point at that mode to get a scalar α with the formula:

$$\alpha = \frac{x - \mu}{4\sigma}$$

where x is the point, μ is the mean of the mode, and σ is the standard deviation of the mode.

- Concatenate for each point in a continuous attribute the beta vector and alpha scalar to obtain the embedding passed to the Neural Network stage.

Conditional generator and training by sampling A conditional mask vector (Xu et al. 2019) is constructed and filled with all zeros initially and set to 1 at exactly one spot. A random categorical attribute is chosen and a value from that

column is sampled from a probabilistic mass function representing the logarithmic frequency of the values in that column. This ensures that unbalanced columns get a good representation of the minority class too.

A loss is applied between the mask function and generated sample to ensure that value is generated conditionally. Let d_i be such that $d_i^{(k)} = 0$ for every i and k and $d_i^{(k^*)} = 1$ for the real condition in mask ($d_{i^*} = k^*$). The loss function is the cross-entropy between m_i and d_i

Representation of Long tailed distributions Long-tailed distributions are compressed after a certain bound using the logarithmic function to capture the range of the column values (Zhao et al. 2021). An example is that of the transaction amount spent in a credit card dataset; the mean and 95th percentile of the data for Transaction would be a small amount, but there would be some transactions spending one billion or above. Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) which don't apply this transformation are found not to be able to capture the maximum amount like that of a real dataset. The transformation applied is as follows: For such a variable having values with a lower bound l , we replace each value τ with a compressed value τ_c :

$$\tau_c = \begin{cases} \log(\tau) & \text{if } l > 0 \\ \log(\tau - l + \epsilon) & \text{if } l \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

where $\epsilon > 0$. The log-transform allows to compress and reduce the tails of the distribution.

Network structure Network in a conditional GAN uses *gumbel* softmax activation for categorical and mode part of numerical attributes while it uses *tanh* activation for scalar in a numerical attribute. *PACGAN* method is used to reduce mode collapse problems. (Xu et al. 2019)

Performance comparison Amongst the compared GAN methods, the timeline improves performance. The CTGAN was surpassed by CTabGAN which in turn was beaten by metrics of CTabGAN+. The advantages of these considered methods are that pre-processing method are good for mixed and long tailed distributions and most importantly the formidable problem of **imbalanced dataset** is considered and solved by the Conditional generator and *training by sampling*.

H.3 Diffusion based methods

Denoising Diffusion models are the most popular generative model in today's literature. In TabDDPM, the columns which are numerical are denoised from a gaussian distribution while categorical columns are denoised from a multinomial diffusion method. A Multi-layer perceptron learns the noise added in the forward process and is used to generate rows of columnar data. Time embedding is present as an input to the MLP as in a traditional denoising diffusion model.

TABDDPM A traditional application of denoising diffusion models is that of the TabDDPM. It consists of one hot encoding of categorical data which undergoes a multinomial diffusion where the numerical attributes undergo a standard gaussian denoising. (Kotelnikov et al. 2022). An

idea of TABDDPM is shown in Fig 12. The loss function of the diffusion is same as standard Gaussian diffusion for numerical and for discrete attributes KL divergence term as in Eqn.4.

$$L_{\text{TabDDPM}}(t) = L_{\text{simple}}(t) + \frac{1}{C} \sum_{i=1}^C L_i(t) \quad (4)$$

Where C represents the number of categorical variables.




Figure 12: TABDDPM Schematic Diagram

Result Analysis: TabDDPM consistently outperforms TVAE and CTabGAN+ on diverse datasets, highlighting the advantage of diffusion models for tabular data across various domains. The SMOTE method exhibits competitive performance comparable to TabDDPM and often surpasses GAN/VAE approaches, underscoring the importance of comparing against diverse methods in evaluating generative models for tabular data. The study advocates for the use of evaluation protocols employing state-of-the-art models like CatBoost over weaker classifiers/regressors to provide more informative insights into model performance and avoid potential misinterpretation regarding the value of synthetic data generated by generative models.

TABSYN TABSYN is a Latent diffusion model which encodes the data in a latent space and performs diffusion in the latent space. The claim is that the correlation between columns is better preserved in the latent space than diffusion in TabDDPM. It has a VAE to encode data to latent space and a diffusion model which denoises. It consists of a transformer based Beta-VAE which biases reconstruction error loss component over the KL divergence component. The embedding input to the transformer is done by a tokenizer which applies a linear embedding to numerical and one hot embedding lookup for categorical data attributes. Diffusion then takes place in the latent dimension and since diffusion is resistant to noise in the data, we can apply differential privacy based methods in the encoder part of the network. Loss Function of the Autoencoder is given by Eqn.5.

$$L = \ell_{\text{recon}}(x, \hat{x}) + \beta \ell_{\text{kl}} \quad (5)$$

where ℓ_{recon} is the reconstruction loss between the input data and the reconstructed one, and ℓ_{kl} is the KL divergence loss that regularizes the mean and variance of the latent space.




Figure 13: TABSYN Schematic Diagram

Result analysis The experiments compared TABSYN with seven existing tabular data generation methods, including classical GAN and VAE models, and recent state-of-the-art methods. TABSYN consistently outperformed all baseline methods in a standardized setting, demonstrating its superiority across various tasks.

H.4 Transformer Based Methods

Transformer based methods and LLMs have been occupying high prominence accomplishing incredibly hard NLP tasks reasonably. GReaT (Generation of Realistic Tabular data) model encodes numerical and categorical data. The conditioning of columns is done with a subset of columns already available. Then it permutes the columns in random order for training all possible conditioning of the columnar data. This conditioning is an advantage of this method over GAN and diffusion-based methods. TabuLA model speaks of training a foundational model for tabular data instead of using pre-trained GPT weights. This model enhances the quality of tabular data generated as and when more tabular datasets are trained with this model. Advantages claimed by these methods are incorporation of pre trained context knowledge in better learning dependencies and joint distributions. Another important advantage is that of simplicity and easily Interpretability of direct output. One prominent disadvantage is scaling for large datasets where token limit exceeds.

GReaT GReaT (Generation of Realistic Tabular data) (Borisov et al. 2023) is a model which uses the state-of-the-art GPT for its conditional generation of tabular data. This model encodes numerical and categorical data together. The conditioning of columns is done with a subset of columns already available. Then it permutes the columns in random order for training all possible conditioning of the columnar data. This type of conditioning is its claim over GAN based methods.

Pretrained GPT2/ DistilGPT2 model is finetuned for our required dataset. The training data is encoded as a sentence which can be understood by a LLM. The sentence structure is a simple “Col1 is Val1, Col2 is Val2 ...”. Random order of columns is passed in training to learn all possible conditional distributions of different columns given a fixed subset of other columns.

TabuLa This speaks of training a foundational model for tabular data instead of going with pre-trained GPT weights (Zhao, Birke, and Chen 2023). This has the advantage that tokens can be highly optimized compared to using a pre trained LLM. The analysis has found that the more the datasets on which model is finetuned, the better the performance and utility of the synthetic data generated. The

method claimed to be better than the then diffusion and GAN models. The schematic diagram of TabuLa is shown in Fig 14




Figure 14: TabuLa - Schematic figure showing repeated finetuning with new tabular datasets and finally obtaining a foundational model

TABMT Tabular Masked transformers (TABMT) (Gulati and Roysdon 2023) can be trained to predict column values in each row of a tabular dataset. This model has a good balance between privacy and quality. Random order of masks prevent bias caused by position in columnar data. Masking probability from a uniform distribution causes a masked set of all sizes to arise during training. This makes the training and generation very similar. The generation is by sampling column by column which might be a little slower than other methods. Architecture consists of a transformer encoder which takes in embeddings of each column and a dynamic Linear layer at the end which can output logits of different tokens in each column. The preprocessing involves one-hot encoding the categorical values whereas the numerical values are lossily segregated by clustering. **Result Analysis:** For 15 datasets, TABMT performs better than Baselines CTABGAN+, TABDDPM, RealTabFormer and TVAE.

Performance Comparison Amongst all the Transformer based synthesizers discussed so far, best performance is from TABMT. The next in line is the TabuLa and finally the base GReaT method. Overall, the conditional generation is the claim of LLM and Transformer based methods. Privacy metric through Distance to the Closest Record is also shown to be better than their contemporaneous models. (Gulati and Roysdon 2023) (Borisov et al. 2023). Since code for TABMT is not available, our implementation of TABMT did not exceed the performance of GAN and diffusion models and hence we did not use TABMT as a baseline.

H.5 Common Metrics of Evaluation

MLE - Machine Learning Efficiency It quantifies the performance of classification or regression models *trained on synthetic data and evaluated on the real test set*. The model developed using the augmented data should exhibit good accuracy, close to the original model accuracy (or even better in the case of imbalanced data). This demonstrates the utility of the generated data.

Distance to Closest Record Histogram This measure ensures that while synthetic data should resemble real data, it should not be an exact copy. The distance to the closest record in the training data (real) from the synthetic data is calculated. Ideally, this distribution should resemble that between test data (real) and training data (real).

Statistical Similarity The correlation between columns of the original and synthetic data should be similar. The marginal probabilities of individual columns should be captured while also fulfilling the joint distribution to be matched.

The motivation for using Machine Learning Efficacy among other metrics is because of the problem statement involving the goal of increasing the accuracy of a trained classifier in an imbalanced setting. Hence, we only consider the metric Machine Learning Efficacy i.e. measuring the classifier accuracy when model is trained on synthetic data.